

December 12, 2005

BUREAU OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT STUDIES & PLANS – PHASE I Illinois Route 29 Study Peoria, Marshall, Putnam & Bureau Counties Job No. P-94-009-01 Catalog No. 032469-00

Mr. James Johnson
US Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service
2118 West Park Court
Champaign, IL 61821

Dear Mr. Johnson

The Illinois Department of Transportation is studying for a proposed highway improvement in the Illinois Route 29 corridor between Illinois Route 6 in Peoria County and Interstate 180 in Bureau County. An Environmental Impact Statement is currently being developed for the project.

The proposed improvement has been developed by considering a number of alternatives and by carefully reviewing the environmental impacts. Representative of the Peoria, Marshall and Putnam County Natural Resource Conservation Services, Illinois Department of Agriculture, and the Illinois Farm Bureau were part of the IL 29 Resource Agency Technical Committee for the project. The committee has met several times since it was formed in 2002 to discuss the project.

Enclosed are a location map, aerial exhibits, the AD-1006 form, the Illinois Site Assessment Corridor Factor Score Sheet and a list of soils impacted. If there is additional information that would facilitate your review and analysis, please contact Ms. Paula Green of our office at (309) 671-3478 or by email at <a href="mailto:greenpa@dot.il.us">greenpa@dot.il.us</a>.

eph

SVL:tdp\s:\mgr2\winword\std&plns\environment\letters\gvl0001\_james johnson\_usda\_il 29.doc

Enclosure

cc: Environment (P. Green)
IDOA (Attn. Terry Savko)

## U.S. Department of Agriculture



## FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)  Date		Part Of Land Evaluation Request				
NI D. D		Federa	al Agency Involve	d FBWA		
Proposed Land Use Highway Count Peor			nty And Signe oria, Harshall, Putnam & Bureau - Illinois			
			Request Received	4 686		
PART II (To be completed by SCS)		· ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		28-05	·
Does the site contain prime, unique, statewide or	local important fai	rmland?	Yes: N	<b>T</b>   '	d Average Far	7 7
(If no, the FPPA does not apply do not comple	te additional parts	ot this to	rm) 🕱 🗆		armland As Duf	lacd in EPPA
Major Crop(s)	Farmable (and In G	iovt, Jurisai	ov /7 -7		695,90	
Name Of Land Evaluation System Used	Acres A 7,63	Assessment	Sugram	Dave Land FV	aluation Heturn	ed By SCS
Name Of Land Evaluation System Used  IlliNO15	State	1.510	િ	13	1-29-0	5
PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)		<u> </u>	Site A	Alternative S	ite Bating Site C	Site D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly			1056			
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly	روزون <del>المح</del> كان واستو <u>ر مي مي مي المحكون وا</u>		110			-
C. Total Acres in Site	100 1-100	•••	1166			
PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation	n Information				• :	
		<del> </del>	969			
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland     Total Acres Statewide And Local Important	Farmiand	<del></del>	86		<u> </u>	,,
	ovt Unit To Be Co	nverted	D. 0042			
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local G D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With	Same Or Higher Rela	tive Velue	50.7			
PART V. (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation	n Criterion	50	75-112.5		,	
Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converte	0 1302/2010 10 100	/ Dilles/	7	<u> </u>		
PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency)		aximum		1		[
Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 C	FR 658,5101	Points	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
1. Area In Nonurban Use						
2. Perimeter In Nonurban Use			-		<u> </u>	, and a second
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed			<del></del>	e attack	א א	
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Gov	ernment			e anno	-	
5. Distance From Urban Builtup Area	<u> </u>			LUNDIS	CANY	to-
6. Distance To Urban Support Services			<u> </u>			
7. Size Of Present Farm Upit Compared To Ave	tage			actors+		
8. Creation Of Nonfarprable Farmland					J.1	
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services			·			
10. On-Farm Investments  11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	ricet					
12. Comparability With Existing Agricultural Use						
		7490	150			
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS			130	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)						
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	150*	1 <del>00</del>	113			
Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or a I site assessment)		<del>160</del>	106			<u> </u>
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	300 *	<del>-200</del>	219		A ! !	J
Size Salastad	te Of Selection			Wat A Local Site		40 <u>8</u>
Site Selected: Dar					H.C	1481
Reason For Selectors						- an 1

\* When utilizing the state site Assessment Corridor Factors, 150 points are assigned to the Land Evaluation portion, and 150 points are assigned to the site Assessment portion, For a maximum score of 300 points

Mt:SI SARR-16-348

## Illinois Route 29 Study P-94-009-01 Bureau, Marshall, Peoria and Putnam Counties, Illinois Federal Highway Administration Funds

PART VI-B Illinois Site Assessment CORRIDOR Factors	Maximum Points	Site A
Amount of Agricultural Land Required	30	30
2. Location of the Proposed Alignment	30	19
3. Acres of Off-Site Agricultural Land Required for Borrow Materials	15	15
4. Acres of Prime and Important Farmland Required for Mitigation	15	15
5. Creation of Severed Farm Parcels	10	5
6. Creation of Uneconomical Remnants	10	5
7. Creation of Landlocked Parcels	10	5
8. Creation of Adverse Travel	10	5
9. Relocations of Rural Residences and Farm Buildings	10	5
10. Utilization of Minimum Design Standards	10	2
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT CORRIDOR POINTS	150	106
PART VII		· <del>- · · · · ·</del>
Relative Value of Farmland	150	113
Total Site Assessment CORRIDOR Factors	150	106
TOTAL ILLINOIS LESA POINTS	300	219

041806 TS

Illinois Site Assessment Corridor Factor Score Sheet

Factor	Maximum Points	South Section	Central Section	North Section
Amount of Agricultural Land Required (acres)	30	567	198	291
2. Location of the Proposed Alignment	30	_	_	_
a. Percent of route utilizing existing pavement		33	47	40
<ul> <li>b. Percent of route adjacent to existing alignment (but not utilizing existing pavement)</li> </ul>		0	63	38
Acres of Offsite Agricultural Land Required for Borrow Mitigation	15		Unknown	
Acres of Prime and Important Farmland Required for Mitigation	15		Unknown	
5. Creation of Severed Farm Parcels (acres)	10	2,127.0	255.4	1,515.1
6. Creation of Uneconomical Remnant (acres)	10	11.9	2.9	2.1
7. Creation of Landlocked Parcels (acres)	10	44	689	12
8. Creation of Adverse Travel (miles)	10	15.4	0	3.6
<ol><li>Relocations of Rural Residences (RR) and Farm Buildings (FB) (Number)</li></ol>	10	3 RR; 19 FB	5 RR; 7 FB	4 RR; 22 FB
10. Utilization of Minimum Design Standards	10	10 See below		
Total Site Assessment Corridor Points	150			

10. Utilization of Minimum Design Standards: Throughout the IL 29 Phase I design process, specific designs have been employed to minimize impacts to farmland. During the alternatives screening process, alignments with greater agricultural impacts were eliminated. Specifically N-4. which was east of existing IL 29 in the north section (near Putnam), and C-2, the bluff alignment, were both eliminated. The bluff alignment affected 626 acres of agricultural land, 428 acres more than the proposed project in the Central Section. The proposed project would maximize the use of existing right-of-way and minimize new right-of-way required by widening the existing alignment where it is practical and feasible. Bypasses were only recommended when they were the only feasible option. Bypasses were recommended west of Chillicothe and west of Henry because building a 65-mph facility through those communities would have displaced many businesses and residences and created a barrier in the heart of the communities. The use of existing right-of-way was also maximized between IL 6 and Cedar Hills Drive (South Section) by locating the proposed alignment within IDOT's existing right-ofway and selecting the diamond with a loop interchange at Cedar Hills Drive. Selecting this interchange type minimized the impact to privately owned agricultural land north of Cedar Hills Drive. It should be noted that the agricultural impacts of the proposed McGrath interchange are included in the impacts reported on this form, but IDOT has indicated that the interchange would only be built when development in that area is dense enough to warrant an interchange. In other words, the agricultural impacts in the area surrounding the proposed McGrath interchange will precede the construction of the interchange rather than be caused by the interchange.

MUSYM	Prime, Important or Other	Acres Impacted	MUSYM	Prime, Important or Other	Acres Impacted
25G	Other	7	379A	Prime	73
28	Prime	74	379B	Prime	74
37B	Prime	50	398A	Prime	23
54B	Important	37	398B	Prime	15
54D	Important	8	399A	Prime	8
77	Prime	25	399B	Prime	27
87B	Prime	148	406	Prime	1
88C2	Important	12	439B	Prime	97
93E	Other	1	536	Other	2
104	Prime	24	549G	Other	1
107	Prime	5	570A	Prime	8
132	Prime	15	570C	Important	10
145B2	Prime	1	618E	Other	1
148B	Prime	4	857G	Other	3
149	Prime	1	865	Other	5
150A	Prime	8	883F	Other	2
150C	Important	4	2802B	Other	4
152A	Prime	6	3070	Other	1
198	Prime	12	3360L	Other	1
199A	Prime	1	3480	Prime	10
199B	Prime	10	3480L	Other	21
224D3	Important	7	7070	Prime	12
224E	Other	5	7081	Other	9
233C2	Important	8	8077	Prime	8
282F	Other	4	8107	Prime	2
290A	Prime	60	8107A	Other	25
290B2	Other	1	8368A	Prime	41
304B	Prime	134	W	Other	9
344B	Prime	1			